



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/732,541	12/07/2000	Gregory Zoller	CSCO-68341	4178

7590

12/01/2003

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Third Floor

Two North Market Street

San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER

THAI, HANH B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2171

DATE MAILED: 12/01/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/732,541

Applicant(s)

ZOLLER ET AL.

Examiner

Hanh B Thai

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on RCE dated 10/14/2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-13, 15-18 and 26-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1, 14 and 19-25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-13, 15-18 and 26-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2171

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment to claim 1 is acknowledged. Consequently, rejection to claim 1 under 35 U. S.C. 112, second paragraph is withdrawn.
2. Applicant's arguments regarding claims 2-18 and 26-37 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

Claim 2 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because claim 2 can not depend from claim 3. See MPEP § 608.01(n). ~~Accordingly, the claim 2 not been further treated on the merits.~~ M

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 2-13, 15-18 and 26-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoover et al. (U. S. patent no. 5,560,005) of record in view of Challenger et al. (U. S. Patent no. 6,256,712).

Regarding claims 3 and 31, Hoover discloses a method of providing access to information comprising the steps of:

Art Unit: 2171

a) receiving a call from an application program, the call specifying a user identifier and a requested set of information of a plurality of sets of information (see Fig. 3 and col.16, lines 54-58, Hoover). ,

b) in response to the call, determining the location of the requested information corresponding to the user identifier (col. 24, lines 47-49, Hoover);

b1) determining a plurality of fields associated with the requested set of information (see col. 15, lines 5-15 and col. 24, lines 25-33, Hoover); and

b2) accessing a stored mapping of the fields to the databases (see col. 24, lines 9-33, Hoover);

c) using the user identifier, retrieving information corresponding to a first of the plurality of fields from a first of the plurality of databases (see col. 24, line 60 to col. 25, line 8 and Fig. 1, Hoover). The information of the “client site 1” corresponds to the first of the plurality of fields from a first of the plurality of databases;

d) using the user identifier, retrieving information corresponding to a second of the plurality of fields from a second of the plurality of databases (see col. 24, line 60 to col. 25, line 8 and Fig.1, Hoover). The information of the “client site 2” corresponds to the first of the plurality of fields from a first of the plurality of databases; and

e) providing the set of information to the application program, retrieved from the first and second databases without requiring storage on an intermediate database (see col. 11, lines 48-67, Hoover).

Art Unit: 2171

Hoover, however, does not explicitly disclose “ storing in a cache the set of information ... if a pre-determined time has passed since the set of information was accessed, removing the set of information from the cache”.

Challenger, on the other hand, discloses these limitations (see Abstract and Summary of Challenger). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Hoover to remove the information from cache or delete stale information when the pre-determined time has been out because it is for the security reason and system’s efficiency.

Regarding claim 2, Hoover/Challenger combination further discloses determining the entitlement status corresponding to the user identifier with respect to the set of information (see col. 16, lines 31-35, Hoover).

Regarding claims 4-5, Hoover/Challenger combination further discloses the step of updating a first of the plurality of fields in the set of the information by writing information to a first of the plurality of databases (see col. 27, line 62 to col. 28, line 10, Hoover).

Regarding claim 6, Hoover/Challenger combination further discloses that the update is based upon monitoring activit of a user of the application program, the activity being related to the information (see col. 53, lines 23-37, Hoover).

Art Unit: 2171

Regarding claim 7, Hoover/Challenger combination further discloses a first database with entitlement information thereon and a second database with user profile information thereon (see col. 14, line 60 to col. 15, line 31, Hoover).

Regarding claim 8, Hoover/Challenger combination further discloses the steps of providing a parameter to the application program and the application program passing the parameter when requesting user profile data (see col. 29, lines 1-4, Hoover).

Regarding claim 9, Hoover/Challenger combination further discloses the step of moving the information corresponding to a first of the plurality of fields from a first of the plurality of databases to a second of the plurality of databases (col. 24, lines 9-33, Hoover).

Regarding claims 10, 16 and 26, Hoover discloses a computer readable medium having stored thereon program instructions for providing access to information stored on a plurality of databases:

- the program further operable to process requests from an application program, the requests identifying a first of the plurality of logical collections of the information and a first of a plurality of users (see col. 11, lines 48-67, Hoover);
- the program further operable to retrieve the information corresponding to the at least the first of the plurality of fields, the information corresponding to the user identified by the request from the application program (see col. 12, lines 1-19 and Fig. 2-3, Hoover).

Art Unit: 2171

Hoover, however, does not explicitly disclose the logical mapping and physical mapping of the plurality of fields of the information to the plurality of databases. But, Hoover, discloses the mapping of the plurality of fields of the information to the plurality of databases (see Abstract and col. 40, lines 24-56, Hoover). At machine level like the system of Hoover have to have physical address to locate an physical record (see col. 17, lines 4-14, Hoover), and a record have to have the identification (see col. 41, lines 10-19, Hoover) to specify the record that is logical mapping of the records.

Furthermore, Hoover does not disclose “ storing the set of information and removing the set of information ... if it has not been accessed for a pre-determined period of time”.

Challenger, on the other hand, discloses these limitations (see Abstract and Summary of Challenger). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Hoover to remove the information from cache or delete stale information when the pre-determined time has been out because it is for the security reason and system's efficiency.

Regarding claim 11, Hoover/Challenger combination further discloses the computer wherein the plurality of databases comprises a first database and a second database (see col. 14, line 60 to col. 15, line 44, Hoover).

Regarding claim 12, Hoover/Challenger combination further discloses the computer wherein the first database comprises entitlement information (see col. 15, lines 32-62, Hoover).

Art Unit: 2171

Regarding claim 13, Hoover/Challenger combination further discloses the second database comprises user profile information (see col. 14, line 60 to col. 15, line 31, Hoover).

Regarding claims 15 and 27, Hoover/Challenger combination further discloses operable program to update the information for the first of the logical collections of the information by writing to a first of the plurality of databases (see col. 27, line 62 to col. 28, line 10, Hoover).

Regarding claim 17, Hoover/Challenger combination further discloses the information relates to a single user (see col. 12, lines 20-31, Hoover).

Regarding claim 18, Hoover/Challenger combination further discloses the information pertaining to a group of users (see col. 12, lines 33-52 and Fig.1, Hoover).

Regarding claim 27, Hoover/Challenger combination further discloses the updating of the information for the first of the logical collections of the information (see col. 15, lines 33-44, Hoover).

Regarding claims 28-29, Hoover/Challenger combinations further discloses that the application programs are compliant with different programming languages from one other (see col. 9, lines 48-65 and col. 11, lines 48-55, Hoover).

Art Unit: 2171

Regarding claim 30, Hoover/Challenger combination further discloses the process requests originating from more than one programming language (see, Hoover).

Regarding claim 32, Hoover/Challenger combination further discloses the entitlement status corresponding to the user identifier with respect to the set of information (see col. 14, line 60 to col. 15, line 31, Hoover).

Regarding claim 33, Hoover/Challenger combinations further discloses the updating the plurality of fields in the set of information (see col. 15, lines 33-44, Hoover).

Regarding claims 34-35, Hoover/Challenger combinations further discloses the requesting the set of information comprises information relating to a single user and a group of users (see col. 9, lines 8-47, Hoover).

Regarding claims 36-37, Hoover/Challenger combinations further discloses the providing a parameter to the application program that is used to track active user records (see col. 28, line 30 to col.29, line 10, Hoover).


Art Unit: 2171

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hanh B Thai whose telephone number is 703-305-4883. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Hanh Thai 
Art Unit 2171
November 21, 2003


UYEN LE
AU 2171